



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,437	10/18/2001	Steve Brandstetter	P/94-2	6647

7590 08/23/2004
Philip M. Weiss
WEISS & WEISS
310 OLD COUNTRY ROAD
SUITE 201
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

ONEILL, MICHAEL W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3713	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/982,437	BRANDSTETTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael O'Neill	3713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7-26-04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

The indicated allowability of claim 13 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Acres '567 and Stefan '277. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation of "a bonusing event" is not clearly defined in the specification. The specification appears silent with respect to what constitutes "a bonusing event". The specification appears only state that "a or the" "bonusing event" occurs because of a trigger event.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The

Art Unit: 3713

claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The limitation of "wherein players playing said linked gaming machines who enter said bonusing event compete against each other at said bonusing event" is non-enable by the specification. The specification does not explain how the players would compete against each other. The specification appears to be enabling only for competition between a player on the gaming machine and the interactive sign.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3713

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stefan '277.

Stefan '277 discloses and teaches a gaming system where players compete against each other for the top prize; i.e. the highest ranked player wins the bonus money. As described by Stephan, players play linked gaming machines as fast as they can to achieve the highest payout per machine, this is the player competing against each other and portions of their bets pool the bonus payout. The gaming machines are disclosed as being linked together via a central computer. The interactive sign for

Art Unit: 3713

Stephan is the portion of the video display at each gaming machine that shows the amount of the bonus. Because, this is common to all gaming machines it is deemed to be an interactive sign, because the players are competing for winning the jackpot from their respective machines. Also, disclosed as a competition among the players is the players trying to achieve the highest ranking poker hand. The player that achieves the highest rank in either scenario describe above wins the bonus payout. Furthermore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the bonus payout shown on one main display because this would permit visitors to see as well as the players the bonus payout accumulate during the competition time period and then see the winning player of the bonus payout.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acres '567 and Stephan '277.

Acres discloses, teaches and suggests a plurality of gaming machines (10) linked together, see fig. 2, connected to an interactive sign (42). As disclosed a bonusing computer (38) and animation computer (40) that can be consider part of the interactive sign as well. When a triggering event occurs a signal is sent through the network of gaming machines. The trigger event is the total number of coins played by the player. The triggering event initiates a secondary game and a tertiary

Art Unit: 3713


game; together deemed the bonus event, and half of this bonus event is common to the group of gaming machines; while the tertiary game is available to those players to play the largest amount of coins, thus there is competition between the players to play in order to reach the tertiary and win the bonus amounts given in both the secondary game and the tertiary. It is disclosed that the triggering event is the amount of coins played; however, it is silent as to what the games, the bonus event, constitute. However, in an analogous device, Stefan, teaches and suggest that the bonus event can be a competition among players to see who can play the fastest. The players are ranked by the number of coins played per unit time and the player that plays the largest amount of total coins is the player with the highest rank and wins the bonus payout. Therefore, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to incorporate to two discloses and teachings together to form one linked gaming system which allows players to compete to win the bonus in order to a common secondary game, a part of the bonus event, shared with adjoining machines so that the element of competition among players is given and the enjoyment of spectators is enhanced to which is what Acres disclosed invention is trying to solve.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael O'Neill whose telephone number is 703-308-3484. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks, Acting SPE can be reached on 703-308-1745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


MICHAEL O'NEILL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

MON